DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 805 UD 018 460

AUTHOR Gordon, Edmund W.; Coates, Deborah L.
TITLE Retrospective-Qualitative Evaluation of the Wiltwyck Five-Year Interdisciplinary Generic Training Program.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Inst. for Urban and Minority Education.
PUB DATE Jun 78
NOTE 55p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Service Programs; Family Life; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Inner City; *Internship Programs; *Mental Health; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Social Services; Social Work
IDENTIFIERS *Interdisciplinary Generic Training Program

ABSTRACT

The Interdisciplinary Generic Training Program (IGTP) was designed to train graduate students in related mental health fields, as well as persons without formal mental health training, to deliver team approach social services sensitive to inner city community and family life. During the last year of the program, staff members requested a retrospective evaluation of program effectiveness and/or impact with respect to accomplishment of general program and participant specific goals over the five year funding period. The current evaluation is focused on providing several types of information: (1) a summary of participant characteristics over the five year period; (2) determination and synthesis of participant objectives in terms of observable behavioral expectations; (3) documentation of the implementation of program activities as perceived by intern participants and staff; (4) determination of the long and short term program outcomes as perceived by participants in terms of participant growth, increased competence, etc.; and (5) synthesis of reactions, opinions, attitudes regarding program activities and outcomes as perceived by program staff and program participants. (Author/HC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156805

JUL 6 1978

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Retrospective-Qualitative Evaluation of the Wiltwyck Five-Year Interdisciplinary Generic Training Program

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edmund W. Gordon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
June 1978

Edmund W. Gordon, Executive Director*
Deborah L. Coates, Evaluation Consultant

UD018460

*The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Milton Brown and Warren Barksdale in the reviewing of materials used as data sources in various sections of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1.
Delimitations of the Evaluation	2.
Organization of the Report	5.
Program Objectives	6.
Data Source	7.
The Data: Behavioral Objectives	7.
Program Description	10.
The Data Source	10.
The Data: Program Activities	10.
Across Year Differences in Program Activities	16.
Population Description	19.
Intern Characteristics: Across Year Differences	21.
Initial Performance Status of Participants	23.
The Data Source	24.
The Data: Student Functioning Prior to Program Participation	24.
Across Year Differences in Initial Status	26.
Program Outcomes	27.
The Data Source	28.
The Data: Facilitation of Intern Growth	29.
Across Year Differences in Outcomes	32.
IGTP Follow-up	33.
Supplemental Data	33.
The Data: Reactions to the Programs	34.
Interns	34.
Staff	37.
Summary Comments	38.

Retrospective Qualitative Evaluation of the Wiltwyck Five-Year Interdisciplinary Generic Training Program

Deborah L. Coates and Edmund W. Gordon

Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

INTRODUCTION

The social service delivery field has recognized, for some time, the need to restructure and reorient both the focus and the nature of human service delivery procedures and mechanisms to meet the special needs of the poor. One direct approach to facilitating this restructuring is the training of new professionals to deliver social intervention services. In 1970, the Wiltwyck School for Boys, a 35 year old multi-level service agency providing specialized treatment and preventive services for inner city children and their families, began developing a training program with such a focus.

For the fiscal year 1972-73 the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) funded the Wiltwyck agency to implement a multi-disciplinary training program (The Interdisciplinary Generic Training Program, IGTP) to train men and women pursuing graduate training in related mental health fields as well as persons without formal mental health training, to deliver team-approach social services sensitive to the needs and dynamics of inner-city community and family life. The overall objectives of the program were to:

1. ...experiment with using a multi disciplinary team approach model for diagnosis of social problems and delivery of social services to inner-city children and their families

2. ...influence the training methods and systems of graduate programs providing mental health service delivery training

3. ...help provide adequately and appropriately trained manpower for the mental health field

The program was refunded for the fiscal years 1974-75; 1975-76; 1976-77 and 1977-78 and the objectives of the program for each subsequent year of funding remain, essentially unchanged.

Delimitations of the Evaluation

During the last year of funding program, staff have requested a retrospective evaluation of program effectiveness and/or impact with respect to accomplishment of general program and participant-specific goals over the five-year funding period. Such a retrospective evaluation has severe constraints and prior to presenting the evaluation, these limitations are discussed.

The sound evaluation of a program usually requires consideration of several components. These include:

1. Program description/documentation - the determination of the nature, orientation, purpose, activities, and prescribed experiences for program participants.

2. Program objectives - development, review and appraisal of how the participants will be different after the program; what basic behaviors will indicate these changes.

3. Population description - analysis of the demographic and other relevant characteristics of the program participants.

4. Initial status data - determination of the level of performance, state of knowledge, of participants with respect to program goals, prior to participation in the program.

5. Documentation of program outcomes - exploration and analysis of the impact of program participation on participants relative to initial status of participants.

6. Program reactions and incidental outcomes - documentation of participants, staff and related persons' reactions to the nature and outcome of the program, and of outcomes or effects other than those expected as outlined by the program objectives.

There are several problems in addressing these areas from a retrospective standpoint. These several constraints are cited and provided as a framework for considering this retrospective qualitative evaluation. Firstly, it is not always possible, after the fact, to reconstruct what actually occured as program activities or to assess the initial status of program participants in order to determine change in behavior which could be attributed to program impact. Secondly, for the program under consideration, program objectives and/or participant goals are not clearly stated so that assumptions must be made as to what to consider to be desired participant performance after participating in the program. Finally, the evaluator as a "late-comer" to the program process has to make certain assumptions as to the relative importance and interpretation of evaluation information.

An additional constraint, applicable to the current retrospective evaluation, concerns the severe limitations of time and money that have restricted the complete documentation of the evaluation components listed. Therefore severe restrictions are inherent in the current evaluation process.

Focus of the Evaluation

Given these constraints, the current evaluation is focused on providing several types of information:

1. A summary of participant characteristics over the five-year period.

2. Determination and synthesis of participant objectives in terms of observable behavioral expectations.

3. Documentation of the implementation of program activities as perceived by intern participants and staff.

4. Determination of the long-term (over 5-year period) and short-term (at the end of each funding year) program outcomes as perceived by participants in terms of participant growth, increased competence, etc.).

5. Synthesis of reactions, opinions, attitudes regarding program activities and outcomes as perceived by program staff and program participants.

It is impossible to objectively and accurately externally document program outcomes and the nature of program activities over the five-year funding period as data were not collected during each year to address these concerns. In the current evaluation, these components are primarily based on retrospective participant reflection and analysis of program records. Program objectives were determined by analysis of several program documents and structured interviews with key project staff and were re-oriented in terms of participant behavior. Synthesis statements regarding reactions to the program were determined by analyzing written evaluation questionnaires (responded to by participants at the end of each program year) and interviews, with staff and participants, conducted by the evaluator.

Utilizing these information components, the purpose of the present evaluation is to:

1. ...aid the program staff in evaluating the relevance and appropriateness of individual program and participant objectives.

2. ...determine the effectiveness of the activities implemented to facilitate the outcome of stated objectives or to change participant behavior.

3. ...determine how the program was perceived by intern participants, staff and relevant others (eg. agency staff, consultants, institutions, etc.).

These purposes, hopefully, will function to improve existing program practices and to suggest the necessity where applicable, of the institution of new practices in the event such a program continues or is reinstated at some later time.

Organization of the Report

The remainder of the report is organized into six sections which address the several evaluation components previously described: 1. Program objectives, 2. Program description, 3. Population description, 4. Initial status data, 5. Documentation of program outcomes, and 6. Program reactions and incidental outcomes. Each section includes, where applicable, information pertaining to each individual funding year. Statements or information which apply to several years or to all five years are so indicated. For each period being discussed (year or collection of years) the data source is identified and described. A discussion of the data follows and finally, summary comments are offered.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

One of the important features of a useful evaluation process involves the development, review and appraisal of program objectives. In developing and judging the usefulness of objectives it should be kept in mind that objectives should be derived in terms of learner or participant (in this case, intern) behavior and not in terms of program aspects. The focus of each objective, as previously stated, is to pose two questions:

1. How will the interns be different after the program?
2. What are the basic behaviors which indicate these changes.

The first question refers, in the most general form, to the overall objective of the program — why was it started? The second question is directed to the development of more specific participant-based objectives.

The evaluation process presented will examine the relationship between these objectives and actual program outcomes. Ordinarily these objectives are clearly specified and delineated prior to the beginning of program activities. In the case of the IGTP there was, instead, informal agreement among program personnel as to how the program was to influence interns. Program objectives, however, as described in the following section, were clearly delineated and documented. Also, in some cases, where specified by particular institutions which required program staff to respond to student evaluation questionnaires, specific objectives were documented for individual interns. However, in most cases these objectives, as delineated on the institutional evaluation forms, were not written in terms of observable behavioral expectations.

Data Source

As part of the present evaluation some attempt has been made to document what the expectations were for inducing change in the behavior or performance of persons participating in the program as interns. In order to specify these behavioral expectations consultations were held with key program staff: the present director, the present associate director, one of the trainee supervisors and the author/conceiver of the original program proposal. The evaluation team also carefully searched through program documents and records and utilized the following documents in developing the behavioral objectives:

1. Generic Student Placement Plan - Graduate Schools of Social Work - (Addendum #1 to the original proposal)
2. "Philosophy/Objectives" statement
3. Outline for Implementation of IGTP Curriculum Goals (Addendum #6)
4. Curriculum Outline - Program year 1976-77

The Data: Behavioral Objectives (applicable to the entire five-year period)

In discussing intern goals or objectives with the staff it became clear that the major objective of the program was to "teach the student how to work effectively with persons from other disciplines and to understand both the common characteristics and the uniqueness of the several disciplines in human service agencies." (Gregory, 1975). The purpose of this interdisciplinary exposure addresses the second major objective - to teach students to use a variety of techniques (eg. intervention and problem solving strategies) to approach the uniquely complex situations of inner city life. These major program

objectives are accomplished through several lesser objectives aimed at developing the student's sense of professional identity, use of problem diagnosis and communication skills, and knowledge of intervention strategies and resources available to a particular client population.

Specifically the following objectives were drafted as representative of program goals in terms of expectations for intern behavior. The student will:

Professional Identity

1. ...dress appropriately as a mental health service delivery professional.

2. ...use verbal and non-verbal behavior which facilitates the establishment of rapport with peers, supervisors, and clients.

3. ...be able to project self-assuredness and confidence in his/her ability to approach a problem.

4. ...be able to express his/her feelings about clients, agency and problems which arise.

5. ...be able to describe the ethical and confidential constraints of social service delivery work.

Diagnosis and communication skills

6. ...be able to identify salient aspects of client problems and needs.

7. ...use observation in the home and agency to document aspects of client needs.

8. ...be able to conduct a comfortable interview with a client (one-to-one and family) to identify aspects of client needs.

9. ...be able to synthesize and evaluate observations and/or interviews in order to describe client problems and needs.

10. ...be able to prepare well-organized, easily comprehensible, written reports describing client problems and needs and related intervention/advocate strategies.

11. ...be able to orally present easily comprehensible reports which describe client problems and needs and related intervention strategies.

Knowledge of Intervention Strategies/Resources

12. ...be able to work as a team member with persons from other disciplines toward the solution of client problems.

13. ...be able to identify solutions to client problems from a variety of disciplines.

14. ...be able to voluntarily approach peers and supervisors in order to gain assistance in the resolution of client problems.

15. ...be able to describe comprehensively the function and practices of the Wiltwyck agency.

16. ...be able to identify community, family, individual and agency resources which are functional vs. dysfunctional in solving client problems and serving client needs.

17. ...be able to identify the cultural and ethnic characteristics of a client particularly salient to the resolution of that client's problem.

18. ...be able to involve the client in the active resolution of a problem or need.

19. ...be able to describe geographic, service network, power structure, ambience and demographic characteristic of a community salient to the resolution of client problems and needs.

The objectives specified reflect the programs interest in "developing generic casework skills; (and) ...competence in the management of change processes, including individual and group work." (Brown, 1977). Many of the program activities, described in the following section, were particularly suited to both the development and exercise of the behaviors described.

Program outcomes and initial status assessments of participants, to be discussed, will be related to these objectives where possible.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Data Source

Having established what the program set out to accomplish it is now necessary to consider how the program sought to encourage the manifestation of the behavior described in the behavioral objectives. Several approches to collecting program descriptive data were undertaken. Key staff, the director, and the author/conceiver of the original proposal and a sample of interns were interviewed. Program logs including memorandum, letters, position papers, curriculum outlines, records, schedules, and evaluations of students were reviewed. In addition, the original proposal and each subsequent refunding proposal were reviewed. Finally, during the 1977-78 program year on-site observations of program activities were made.

The Data: Program Activities

There are several descriptive characteristics of the program which apply to each funding year. An overall description of the program is presented first and a discussion of differences in program activities for subsequent years follow.

The IGTP is a year-long or semester-long internship at the Wiltwyck School. Ordinarily, interns spend two to two- and a half days per week engaged in program activities and are assigned to one of several of the agencies sites. The staff of the program consisted of a director and,

associate director, several training supervisors (2-5), visiting experts, consultants and administrative/clerical support staff. Interns receive a stipend which ranged from $300 - $500 per month depending on the number of dependents.

Major program activities consisted of several different components. These included:

- seminars/lectures
- individual case assignments
- team assignments
- regularly scheduled consultations with staff

Seminars

Seminars were conducted on a weekly and fortnightly basis, were held at an agency site and were generally attended by 80-90% of the interns. Seminars were conducted by agency staff, program staff, visiting professors, visiting mental-health professionals, and a variety of other "experts". The format of these seminars varied from lecture/discussion to workshop/group-exchange. However, most of the seminars tended to utilize a lecture format. Seminars usually lasted $1\frac{1}{2}$ - 2 hours and were held on Fridays in order to accommodate the schedules of interns.

In general the content-themes of these seminars focused on issues related to community care. The purpose of the seminars appears to have been two fold: 1. To acquaint interns with several kinds of factual knowledge and 2. To provide a forum for the discussion of current individual agency and/or client centered problems and issues. Examples of seminar topics include:

- Family Court organization
- Report writing
- Use of role-playing
- Child-care systems
- Communicating with children
- Student evaluations and assignments
- Socio-economic and cultural factors in diagnostic formulation
- IGTP project administration
- Children's rights
- Law and education
- Organizational structure at Wiltwyck
- Developing interview skills

Individual Case Assignments

Each intern was assigned, by intern and staff mutual consent, to an individual child or family identified as having a social-service related need or problem. The intern, under supervision, usually informal, was responsible for diagnosing and serving the case. Interns usually met with clients in therapy sessions, conducted home visits and acted as advocates for the individual or family, in dealing with agencies and institutions in the procurement of necessary resources. Most of the interns were responsible for monitoring a case for eight months although some intern case monitoring lasted as few as three to four months.

Team Assignments

Interns were either assigned or self-selected to teams — usually two or three per year — or dyads or triads comprised of representatives from the variety of disciplines represented that year. Each team, dyad or triad, was responsible for identifying an agency or community need or problem and devising a systematic cooperative approach to solving the problem which resulted in either a service or produce which addressed the need. These negotiations plans and procedures evolved informally and were to be based on multidisciplinary input.

Consultations with Staff

It appears that trainer-supervisors and consultants at each agency site were identified and/or presented to interns and in some cases formally arranged consultation - feedback sessions were regularly scheduled. In some situations, however (eg. in some program years), arrangements for sessions with staff were designated primarily to the initiative of each intern. Consultation sessions with supervisors, trainers or consultants served the purpose of providing feedback and guidance for intern case and project management.

Summer Orientation

Another feature of the program held only during the 1977-78 program included an intensive three-week summer orientation. Interns participated in seminars and workshops designed to introduce them to the agency, the specialized population with which they would be working, and to the kinds of generic training they would receive.

Specific Activities

Examples of specific student activities and projects are presented in order to describe more fully the nature of program activities.

1973-74

- co-intern led group therapy with adolescent boys in residential care
- individual case assignments - severe economic problems of residential treatment child's family
- intern organization of a mother's therapy support group
- intern advocate for hospitalized mother of residential care adolescent
- organization of workshop to assist adolescents in the handling of sexually provocative behavior

1974-75

- co-leader led group therapy for bilingual adolescent boys
- tri-person preparation of a directory of community services
- after-care monitoring of adolescent boy released from residential care (intern)
- organization of intern-led workshops on community care
- teacher aid for elementary class of acting out youngsters at the Day Center
- development of proposals for funding of cummunity service projects (team)
- development of self-esteem enhancement program for two adolescent boys (intern)
- staff-liason to other agencies (intern)

1975-76

- development of plans for a co-leader led drama group with bilingual adolescents
- team-led recreation group for 11-12 year-old boys
- inter-agency committee representative
- after-care monitoring of an adolescent youngster
- legal advocate in Family Court
- team development of a legal rights manual
- educational evaluation and development of educational recommendations for 16-year old youngster recently released from residential care
- teaching Black-history at Day Center (intern)
- inter-agency liason (intern)
- team-monitoring of multi-problem family
- crisis counseling with 17-year old rape victim (intern)
- development of focused on adolescent medical concerns - physical and psychological (team)
- development of resource pamphlet on health issues pertinent to the Black community (intern)

1976-77

- individual and group therapy sessions
- individualized tutoring in math and reading (intern)
- team organized task force addressing assessment of agency operations and funding
- intern development of a praverbal therapy group (music, movement, drama and art as therapeutic communication)
- team-led advocacy for a multi-problem family

1977-78

- development of teacher-training manual for using art as therapy (intern)
- co-led group therapy for adolescent boys and girls in Day Care School
- after-care monitoring of boys released from residential day care
- team-organized intervention with multi-problem family
- intern led drama group
- intern co-produced public relations film documenting program activities also used as therapeutic tool with Day Care School boys (dyad)
- intern development of a comic book for adolescents illustrating various inner city adolescent concerns and problems (intern)
- team-led health education program
- team-led workshops (health, arts and crafts, recreation, cosmetics)
- liason responsibility with other agencies (intern)
- intern organized music therapy
- team-led production of Kwanza celebration for Day Care adolescents
- intern participation in organization and delivery of home-maker services

Across Year Differences in Program Activities

As indicated by the descriptions of specific intern projects and involvements there are quite a variety of experiences represented. However, there are some differences in the implementation of the program "treatment" or learning experiences for program participants. One of the most striking differences across years is reflected by analyzing the substantive nature of

intern involvement became substantially more varied and less uniformly therapeutic or social case work oriented. For example, 1973-74 activities are almost entirely encompass traditionally social work approaches. In subsequent years, although clinical social work oriented activities were undertaken, there were also educationally, legally community organization, and artistically based activities. There were a particularly wide variety of activities during the 1975-76 and 1977-78 program years.

These substantive differences in program activity may have been influenced by differences in staff compliments during each program year. For the first two program years, 1973-74; 1974-75, the staff was almost entirely represented by persons with advanced training in social-work. Only in the last three program years, 1975-76; 1976-77; 1977-78, were there representatives on staff of a variety of disciplines — human relations, education, urban studies, law, medicine, clinical psychology, nursing and social work. The 1976-77 program year had the most varied compliment of staff while 1975-76 and 1977-78 tended again to be dominated by staff trained primarily as social-work and/or clinical experts.

Another substantive focus also exists across program years. It appears that early in the program, the first two years, there was an emphasis on the development of clinical skills. In subsequent years, while the focus on the development of clinical skills remained, there was also an emphasis on the development of professional-interrelationships and community organization skills. There was also a shift in emphasis, during the last three program

years, away from process-orientation to a product-orientation. In other words, there was an increasing interest in what tangible effort or product the interns could produce, which represented their efforts, as opposed to almost total interest in the development of clinical and/or community skills.

Another cross-year program difference involves the length of time interns spent at the agency or involved with specific projects. During the first year, 1973-74, almost all of the interns remained with the project for a full year and were involved, essentially with the same cases for the entire year. In subsequent program years and particularly in the final funding year, 1977-78, there were an increasing high number of interns who participated in projects for only half-a-year or a semester. Also, there appear to have been instances of intern involvement which excluded individual or family case-work assignments.

As the program evolved there also appears to have been less assignment of interns, on the part of the staff, to particular projects as students apparently self-selected at least a major portion of their involvements. The "assignment" function probably took on more of a guidance role as some effort was still maintained to match student interests with some already existing agency projects. However, since interns were increasingly encouraged, as the program progressed to develop their own activities, there was probably an increasing self-selection factor operating in the specification of intern involvement.

The program activities described are necessarily assumed to have impacted on intern behavior and the development of skills as specified by the

behavior objectives listed. The analysis of the impact of these activities on intern behavior are examined in a subsequent section of this report.

POPULATION DESCRIPTION

Data Source

Characteristics of the group of individuals served by the IGTP which may be of interest and, more importantly, which may be relevant to a discussion of program outcomes are presented. The process for selecting interns is discussed as well. The evaluation team relied on the original proposal, a discussion with the author of this proposal, subsequent refunding proposals, and student NIMH trainee applications, for this information.

The Data: Intern Selection and Characteristics

Selection

For each of the five program years, interns were selected in primarily the same manner. Students were recruited from two sources — graduate and undergraduate programs at schools in the City of New York and community-based persons and programs. Recruitment from these two sources reflects the program interest in training both indigenous, less-informally trained individuals as well as persons seeking advanced degrees in the social service delivery area. The basic criteria for identifying individuals through community-based programs was, "the potential for delivering effective person-to-person assistance coupled with a capacity for learning and flexibility." (Hellman, 1971).

Interns recruited from undergraduate and graduate programs were jointly selected by the agency, program staff and the institution. Institutions were contacted, names of possible interns were submitted by institutions and potential interns were interviewed by several persons, separately. Finally a conference between program staff and the individual was used to come to a determination of whether the internship experience would be beneficial. It appears that selection usually took place at the end of the academic year, in May or June, for placement in the following year's program or in September of the year.

Intern Characteristics: The Total Group Over the Five-Year Period

There were approximately 90 individuals who participated in the program during the five year period. The group was almost evenly divided with respect to gender although slightly more females participated. Almost half of the total group are self-identified as Black. Of the remaining students, approximately 47, about 20 are White and 18 are designated Hispanic. There was also, one West Indian participant.

The interns were quite varied with respect to educational level and discipline orientation. Most of the participants (about 74 students) were either in undergraduate or masters level graduate programs at the time of their participation. Of these 74 students, about 42 were in masters programs. The remaining 20 or so participants, of the total, 90 were doctoral candidates at the time of participation.

Several disciplines or orientations for practice were represented at various points during the five-year period although this representation is weighted heavily in favor of some disciplines. Of the total group of 90 interns served, almost half (approximately 41) were social work or clinical psychology students. Of the remaining interns two were law students, seven nursing or health administration students, six were special education students. One student was an undergraduate government major. Eighteen of the participants declared no discipline orientation (eg. liberal arts/undergraduate).

Intern Characteristics: Across-Year Differences

The complement of discipline representation changes considerably from IGTP program year to program year. During the 1973-74 and 1974-75 program year, 56% and 52%, respectively, of the interns were social work students and of the remaining 1973-74 students, only law and special education were represented as disciplines. And in 1974-75, other students were special education majors or undeclared. As the program evolved however, considerably more desciplines were represented particularly during the 1975-76 and 1976-77 program years. Variety in discipline representation is also apparent in the 1977-78 group of interns although this is somewhat less true.

In 1975-76 there were considerably less social work students represented, only 27%. In addition, psychology (13% of the students), nursing (13%) and special education (13% of the students) were represented. Again, some undergraduate students specified no discipline affiliation (27%). In 1976-77 an even

greater number of related fields were represented. A smaller percentage of social work students were represented (21%) however, a greater percentage of psychology students participated (21%). In addition, the nursing (10%), special education (10%), crime and delinquency (11%), minority mental health (21%) and business (5%) fields were represented. During 1976-77 there were only 2 (11%) undeclared interns. In 1977-78, approximately 36% of the students were social work and 21% psychology students. Sixteen percent were health administration students, 36% art/drama/music students and 5% government students.

Differences in education levels —undergraduate vs. graduate masters and graduate doctoral students— also fluctuate markedly from year to year. For the first two program years no doctoral candidates were served and approxmately 70% of the interns were masters level students and 30% undergraduates. During the remaining three program years this trend changes considerably. In 1975-76, 27% of the students served were undergraduates, 53% masters level students and 20% doctoral candidates. In 1976-77 and 1977-78 almost 50% of the participants were undergraduates and approximately 30% masters and 20% doctoral level students.

There were also considerable differences, from year to year in male vs. female ratios and ethnic-group representation among students. During four of the five program years 1973-74, 1974-75, 1976-77 and, 1977-78, there were considerably more female than male participants, 63% as compared to 38%, 59% as compared to 41%, 68% as compared to 32%, and 72%

as compared to 30%, respectively. For the 1975-76 year there were almost equal numbers of male and female participants.

With respect to ethnic representation among interns there was a trend, as the program evolved for greater minority-group representation. In 1973-74, 50% of the students were White, 38% Black and only 13% Hispanic. In 1974-75 only 30% of the students were White and about 35% were Black and 35% Hispanic. In 1975-76 there was the lowest percentage representation of White interns (13%). Sixty-percent and 27% of the remaining 1975-76 interns respectively were Black or Hispanic. In 1976-77 52% of the students were Black, an increased number, over the previous year, 26%, were White and fewer students (16%) were Hispanic. The 1977-78 distribution of ethnic representation is essentially the same as described for 1976-77.

INITIAL PERFORMANCE STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS

The status variable of particular concern in the evaluation of a program has to do with answering the following question: How much do the participants already know with respect to what they are supposed to be trained to do? Since one of the concerns of program evaluation is the documentation of change in individuals having experienced a program it is not sufficient to discuss only what the participants know or how they function at the end of the program. Some assessment is also necessary of how participants were functioning, along the dimension of performance of interest, prior to their program experience. Usually this assessment is made prior to the beginning of the program. However, in the present evaluation this determination is made retrospectively and with some degree of speculation.

The Data Source

The determination of the initial status of program participants is primarily based on a review of notes prepared as documentation of student selection interviews, perceptions of students as to how they had changed at the end of the program as reflected in a program evaluation questionnaire, and staff expressions of perceived growth as reflected in their end-of-year evaluations of students. The description of student performance status is also based on interviews with 1977-78 staff and the original proposal author, as to their perceptions of pre-program functioning.

The Data: Student Functioning Prior to Program Participation

The initial status of program participants is related to some of the demographic characteristics described in the previous section. The demographic characteristics of intern participants are quite different from year to year and initial status descriptions from year to year highlight some of these differences, although not exclusively. There are, however, some initial performance characteristics of the interns which seem to generalize from year to year. There seem to be initial status characterizations which apply to graduate vs. undergraduate and "new careerists" (lay participants) and characteristics which apply to students with minority group backgrounds as compared to students with other backgrounds. These initial status characterizations are not mutually exclusive but tend to be characteristics of these special groups.

Those initial status performance characteristics, based on program behavioral objectives, which seem to apply to all interns include:

1. Lack of experience with the especially complex interaction of cultural, ethnic socio-economic and socio-emotional characteristics, as expressed in the Wiltwyck population of clients

2. Unfamiliarity with the process and utility of working as a team member with persons from other disciplines in developing solutions to client problems

3. Limitations in ability to express feelings about client; agency or personal problems

4. Limitations in ability to synthesize and evaluate observations and/or interviews in order to describe client problems and needs

5. Unfamiliarity with community, family, individual and agency resources which may be functional in solving client problems

6. Unfamiliarity with the function and practices of the Wiltwyck agency.

Initial status performance characteristics which seem to characterize undergraduates as compared to graduates are:

1. Lack of facilitating in establishing rapport with peers, supervisors and clients.

2. Limitations in ability to express and project self-assuredness and confidence in problem-solving skill.

3. Poorer proficiency in handling crisis situations and identifying client problems.

4. Less adequately developed report writing skills.

5. Limitations in ability to orally present reports on client problems, needs and intervention strategies.

Even though all of the pariticpants probably did not have overwhelming experience in dealing with the specialized client population to which they were exposed some students probably had more familiarity and skill in interacting

with the client population than others. For instance, special education and some clinical psychology students may have had extensive exposure to adolescent mental health and educational problems, and some minority students may have had greater familiarity with salient cultural, community and ethnic characteristics of the client population. It should also be noted that in the case of many interns, throughout the five years, there were individuals participating in the program who were judged to be exemplary and highly rated on most of the program objectives prior to participating in the program.

Across-Year Differences in Initial Status

As demographic characteristics of intern participants fluctuate from year to year so do initial performance characterizations of interns. It appears that the 1973-74 and 1974-75 groups of interns were rather highly skilled in the diagnosis and communication skills objectives and had considerably little experience with the specialized group of clients. In addition, the characterizations described previously, as applying to all interns generally, which relate to knowledge of intervention strategies, characterize this intern group as well.

In the final three years of the program the interns seem to initially have had greater experience and familiarity with the nature of the specialized client population and less experience in diagnostic and case reporting skills. The general initial status characterizations apply to these interns as well. These interns also appeared to have less confidence as a group, in their ability to act as change agents for clients and in projecting professional identity.

These initial status characterizations, do not, of course, apply to every individual intern but are generalizations which provide some anchor for discussing program outcomes. Specifically, the impact the program had on influencing the process of changing these characterizations are discussed in the following section of the report.

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

The present evaluation is based on a model which presumes an interrelationship between program activities (or learning experiences), program objectives, and the status of participants, in this case interns, after a year of program involvement. Program involvement essentially refers to participation in the set of activities described in the "Program Description" section. Obviously, in a program of the scope and magnitude of the IGTP, the interrelationships between program goals, activities and outcomes are highly complex. It is clear that in many ways objectives have influenced learning activities and vice versa. Unfortunately, data was not collected at several points during the program's execution in order to sufficiently tease out these interrelationships. There is no way of accurately speculating about subtle evolutions in program activity and/or re-evaluation goals and objectives. Instead, this evaluation must make an ex-post facto summative judgment regarding what the interns accomplished in the way of "moving" toward the behavior described in the behavioral objectives.

The discussion of program outcomes is further complicated by the fact that the present program yields two outcomes by which success can be measured. The primary outcome is change in intern performance. A secondary outcome, however, is the documentation of the success interns have in managing individual family and group cases and/or projects of various types. Given the constraints of this evaluation as discussed, the focus is on the description of primary outcomes only. However, it should be kept in mind that information regarding secondary or client outcomes is important in substantiating or corroborating intern impact more objectively.

A comment, regarding the qualititative aspect of this evaluation, also deserves mention. The skills which the program is concerned with promoting are highly complex. In some instances the performance, along certain prescribed dimensions as outlined in the behavioral objectives, defy "objective" paper and pencil assessment and are only open to long-term observation or intuition. The use of a qualitative/descriptive approach to documenting this kind of progress, therefore, seems both useful and necessary and should not be regarded as a substitute for more quantitative data but a way of approaching outcome assessment of these particular goals in the most sensitive manner.

The Data Source

Several sources of information were consulted in a consolidated effort to provide a descriptive picture of program results. Staff and students of the 1977-78 program were interviewed regarding their perceptions of intern progress and major accomplishments; randomly selected sample of reports

or case studies on cases or projects managed by interns were examined; 1976-77 taped interviews between the director and individual interns were reviewed, and finally, for each program year, staff mid-year and year-end evaluations of student progress were considered.

The Data: The Facilitation of Intern Growth

There are several comments which generalize from program year to program year. Firstly, it is difficult to generalize from these outcomes to one specific population since the nature of the sample of interns changed from year to year.

It is also difficult to generalize from this group of ninety interns as there appears to be evidence of differential program participation. It seem that the level of involvement, regularity in appearance on site, etc. varied somewhat from intern to intern. Some interns appeared to have been on site and involved in programs for 3-4 days per week for a full 9 months while some were involved only for a semester (3-4 months) and some interns apparently were rarely seen.

It would appear, also that outcomes were differential for undergraduate and new careerists vs. graduate student interns. It seems that generally undergraduates, who made substantial skill gains were acquiring new factual knowledge regarding performance. While graduate students were primarily utilizing the program activities to practice skills many of which were acquired prior to program involvement. While this distinction is generally true, it also appears that undergraduates made the greatest gains in the development

of the ability to establish rapport with staff, peers and clients, to handle crisis situations and in the development of self-confidence and professional identity.

Graduate students, on the one hand, seemed to make the most progress in the area of developing intervention strategies. Specifically, they seemed to develop a sense of the importance of multiple approaches to problem solving and to begin to use interdisciplinary team focus and functioning effectively. Undergraduates, on the other hand, may have acquired more first hand knowledge and information but were not entirely at the level of utilizing this knowledge by application. This is not, of course, true of every undergraduate participant. In fact, there were a few undergraduate interns who came to the program functioning at very high skill levels.

Documentation of intern progress is further complicated by the fact that there is little variance in staff comments and/or ratings of students from semester to semester (where such comparisons are possible). The IGTP Supervisor Evaluation of Field Work (see Appendix) and several institution-specific performance evaluation forms required staff to rate such traits as: responsibility, sensitivity to clients' needs and problems, ability to function effectively in delivery of service, awareness of ethnic and community factors, respect for confidentiality, response to supervision, skill in organizing tasks and time, capacity for personal growth, ability to handle stress and ability to work with others.

In general interns were rated on these characteristics from "excellent" or "above average" to "average" or "good". The primary categories where negative ratings or less than exemplary ratings occured was in attendance, and handing in reports. Because of this lack of variance in rating, it is difficult to document change. It appears that three categories of outcome or progress characterization emerge for these dating data. Interns were either: 1. Excellent, highly skilled in terms of program goals and remained so; 2. Ineffective in several areas, strong in one or two, particularly sensitivity to clients and responsibility and made little progress or were 3. weak in several areas initially and made slight progress toward average functioning in these areas.

Although it is difficult to document systematic change there are several general kinds of progress or achievements which seemed to recur among the outcome data. These included:

1. Many interns developed greater self-confidence in their approach to client/peer/supervisor interaction and began to project a sense of professional identity

2. Several interns began to demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the purpose and fuctioning of Wiltwyck and other community agencies and resources

3. Almost all of the interns developed a greater awareness of the cultural, ethnic, community and socio-emotional factors operating in management of their projects or cases

4. Several interns demonstrated increased skill in planning how to use community and family resources in the solving of problems

5. Interns became more proficient in oral communication skills

6. Some progress was made toward utilization of team approaches to case management

7. Almost all interns demonstrated greater facility in establishing rapport with clients

There were also some objectives or skills, in which there seemed to be little movement or change. These areas included:

1. Development of case writing skills (most case studies analyzed at the beginning of program year and compared with end of year reports indicate little change. Reports are generally concerned with physical and other demographic characterizations, anecdotal accounts of family situations and narratives of day-to-day functions provided in the management of the case).

2. Development of diagnostic skills and/or counseling skills. It appears that interns who were functioning on a high level, in these areas continued to do so and that interns who experienced some problems in these areas were reassigned to other activities and made no essential skill changes.

It was not possible, with the accessible data sources, to document change with regard to some of the program objectives. There relate primarily to: effective use of supervision, intern dress and use of verbal and non verbal rapport facilitative behavior, expression of feelings, interview and synthesis skills.

Across-Year Differences in Outcomes

There are some differential emphases in outcomes when considered by program year. One of the overwhelming differences involves what appears to be a process vs. product outcome distinction. In the first three years of the program there appear to be outcomes documented which focus on the development of clinical skills, diagnosis, interviewing, etc. In the latter two years the program was more focused on documenting progress

through the expression of more tangible products — an event, a pamphlet, etc. These different outcome foci may reflect the fact that the program was under different administrations for these two periods and may have had very different program activity foci.

In the latter two years of the program there also appears to have been greater progress toward the expression of professionalism and the real application of multi-disciplinary team functioning in a variety of situations. Clearly, most of the positive outcomes of the first three years of the program are in terms of demonstrated one-to-one case management or one person group management.

IGTP Follow-up

One of the objectives of the program was to increase manpower in the mental health profession. In an attempt to assess this outcome the project staff conducted a mail survey (see Appendix) of all past IGTP interns in order to determine job functioning. Of 75 questionnaires mailed, only two were returned answered, and 15 were returned by the postal service. There seems to be evidence that four interns have been accounted for as working in a mental health capacity.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Data Source

In conclusion, a summary of participant intern and staff (both immediate and agency) reactions to the program experience and opinions regarding program functioning are presented. These summary comments are based on

interviews conducted by the evaluation team with 1977-78 staff and interns and on the written responses to evaluation questionnaires provided by interns at the end of each program year.

The Data: Reactions to the Program

Interns

There are some reactions to the program which seem consistent over the five program years. Participant concerns involved primarily issues of agency and program structure and staff-intern communications. These reactions were summarized in a report to the program on staff-intern relationships conducted in April of 1977.

Interns seemed to feel that the program lacked enough structure. This seemed particularly true of undergraduates while most graduates enjoyed this built-in flexibility with respect to structure and agency functioning there were also some concerns expressed regarding intern roles as both professional and student. The distinction and/or determination of how to act in given situations was apparently not always made clear.

Most participants also expressed the need for more information about program functioning, and the work of other interns. Students generally expressed a great deal of satisfaction in their work but desired greater interaction with these peers.

Seminars were rated differentially. Those seminars conducted by acting professionals rather than academics were rated very highly by interns. Also, seminars which consisted primarily of interactive interchange among interns were more highly rated than lecture-format seminars.

Interns rated the interdisciplinary focus and the clarity of program objectives as the most positive aspect of the program. They also suggested that a great deal of what they "learned" was a result of informal interaction with fellow interns and not strictly due to supervision or seminars. Those interns with little counseling experience also indicated their one-to-one case counseling experiences were extremely valuable in stimulating their growth and self-awareness.

Even though some students felt there was not enough supervision or guidance when asked to rate the quality of supervision provided responses indicated that this supervision was conscientious and of the highest quality and usefulness. Specific high praise was offered for training supervisors in each program year.

Most of the negative aspects of the program cited had to do with factors related to the programs being housed in an agency experiencing severe financial and staff moral problems. Students felt they were often perceived as threatening to other staff, and were prevented from functioning by bureacratic hassles and lack of institutional support.

Suggestions for improvements seem to focus around three major issues:

1. Program structure: utilization of more formal feedback mechanisms needed to monitor intern activities.

2. Interns need to be fully integrated and accepted into the functioning of the agency and accepted as a vital, important part of the agencies accomplishments and;

3. The focus of all activities needs to be directly on the provision of services to the client population and very little energy should be expanded in activities directed toward activities which do not directly benefit clients.

Across-Year Comparisons: Reactions to the Program

In addition to general reactions the major differences in focus, with respect to either identification of positive outcomes, negative program aspects or suggestions for improvements are presented for each program year.

1973-74

1. There needed to be a greater focus on interdisciplinary functioning; more disciplines needed to be represented among interns; social work orientation too great.

2. The program was not long enough to exercise newly developing skills.

3. Agency always cooperative, helpful and supportive.

4. Seminars needed substantial content revision; mostly a rehash of what already acquired information.

1974-75

1. Program needed greater concentration on community organization skills.

2. Seminars should have included more content on history of community and group discussion format should be prevalent. Also need greater representation of legal profession.

1975-76, 1976-77, 1977-78

Comments essentially similar to those expressed for the general group. A few exceptions exist for the 1977-78 year:

1. Agency functioning and problems extremely detrimental to intern functioning.

2. Interns should have assisted each other with counseling training, e.g. video tape viewing of each other, feedback, etc.

3. School and agency interface should have been greater.

Staff

Staff reactions to the program are based on interviews with the 1977-78 program staff and with the author of the original proposal who has observed the program, from a distance, for five years. There are some slight discrepancies between staff perceptions of program administration and program success and intern perceptions of these program aspects.

Staff felt, unlike the interns, that most of the "training" went on in seminars. Staff indicated the importance of the summer orientation period in training interns. This training period was apparently not perceived as very valuable by interns. Staff and interns, however, were in agreement as to the negative effect on the program of the agencies overall problems during the last two program years. Organizational atmosphere was cited as the major hindrance to program activity.

An important incidental result of the program is cited by program staff. It would appear that, in several instances, agency staff experience the evolution of some movement toward being more multidisciplinary in focus and oriented toward perceiving their professional role as one of interactive "helper" with other colleagues. The resources of others were perceived as helpful.

There was disagreement among the staff regarding perception of the relationship of the program to student institutions. Some program staff felt these interrelationships were handled well and to the best advantage of the overall program and the students. However, other staff members felt interchange between school and program was not handled well and that program had little status in eyes of institutions or impact on institutions as desired.

Staff suggestions for improved program functioning include:

1. Rotation of interns from site to site for broader integration of program and interns into agency.

2. Full 12 month period of participation necessary as real staff members eg. spending full days, entire week, at site.

3. Development of good communication/feedback network between interns and staff.

4. Clearer definition of intern role re: the agency.

5. Greater participation of agency in training interns.

6. Development of intern participatory model for training.

7. Selective involvement of institutional (school) staff in curriculum development.

8. Clear development and use of ways of measuring individual growth.

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Despite the limitations inherent in the present evaluation, the overriding evidence seems to be in favor of the generalized success of the program in orienting individuals toward multidisciplinary team approaches to mental health service delivery. Although some very specific outcomes are difficult to document, the program does appear to be impacting on participants if merely by exposure to the applied setting of the agency and the interaction with peers from a variety of backgrounds.

The overall best aspects of the program appear to be:

1. The recruitment/selection process for intern involvement. It seems that in each year an outstanding group of individuals were assembled.

2. Interns felt overwhelming positive about their direct contacts with the special service population.

3. Interns felt overwhelming positive about contact with interns from different backgrounds.

Major problems were administrative and or financial and had to do often with factors outside the program's immediate control. There also does not seem to be any evidence of the program's ability, as exists, to either substantially improve counseling (one-to-one) skills or to impact significantly on institutional (school) functioning.

The IGTP is clearly worthwhile. It is hoped that if in the future such a program continues that careful consideration be given uniform specification of program objectives and activities; and that evaluation data— initial status, formative feedback, etc. to be collected so that issues with respect to program success may be more clearly delineated.

APPENDIX

STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE WILTWYCK SCHOOL - INTERDISCIPLINARY GENERIC TRAINING PROGRAM

1977-78 Interview Schedule
(Based on 1973-74 Program Evaluation Questionnaire)

1. What learning tasks provided this year have best equipped you to deliver appropriate service to Inner-City children and families as you perceive these needs? (e.g. in community organizations and service delivery (multidisciplinary)).

2. What additional learning experiences towards the same goal do you believe would be helpful?

3. Have you been assigned a full work load from a quantitative point of view? Did you have to structure your own time, where activities provided, describe?

4. Did you attend seminars, how often?

5. How did the seminar contribute to your knowledge of Inner-City institutional systems and work with children families? Was the content repititious? How much did you learn? (Rating of speakers, academic types vs. professionals from the field. Rating of participation of interns)

6. What ideas would you propose with regard to a different format for seminar than has been the case this year?

7. Was the approach in seminar interdisciplinary?

8. What is your evaluation of the integration or lack of integration between classroom learning and field learning?

9. How do you rate the quality of trainer personnel? (Task Supervisors; Trainer Supervisor; Project Director)

10. How was program administrated? Did you have enough supervision?

11. Was the stipend adequate compensation for your efforts?

12. Was the focus of program activities multidisciplinary

13. How were you in the beginning of the program? How have you changed?

14. What activities were most helpful in producing this change?

15. Describe major problems you had during the year.

16. Did you learn from other interns, how?

17. How much acceptance and support did you experience from the overall agency? In what specific ways has this been evident or lacking?

18. Describe any suggestions you may have for improving the program with respect to your individual needs.

19. Additional comments?

B

IGTP Staff Reactions Interview Schedule

1. Which aspects of the program did you feel were administrated most effectively?

2. Which aspects of the program did you feel were most effective with the students? e.g. helpful, taught them the most

3. What were some of the problems you encountered in administrating the program effectively last year? Were any of the problems serious enough to severely effect the successful training of the interns? e.g. institutional constraints

4. What suggestions do you have for improving the IGTP with respect to providing multidisciplinary training for students? Are these improvements feasible, if so, how would you implement them?

5. How were the interns perceived at your particular site? How did they function with other staff?

6. What changes in growth, development of skills, etc. have you noted in the interns. e.g. how would you characterize them in September, and how now?

7. List overall comments on program successes and problems.

The Wiltwyck School
Illington Road
Yorktown, New York 10598

SUPERVISOR'S EVALUATION OF FIELD WORK

STUDENT UNIT PLACEMENT _____

TRAINER SUPERVISOR _____

TASK SUPERVISOR _____

STUDENT NAME _____

SCHOOL _____

Dates of Placement: From: _____ To: _____

Hours worked per week _____

Please rate student in the following areas (check appropriate column)

	Above Avg.	Avg.	Weak	Comments
Responsibleness of Student				
Sensitivity to clients' needs and feelings				
Ability to function effectively in delivery of service				
Awareness of ethnic and community factors				
Respect for confidentiality				
Response to supervision				
Skill in organizing tasks and use of time				
Capacity for personal growth and development				
Ability to handle stress				
Ability to work with other staff				
Initiative				
Attendance				

Additional comments _____

_____

_____

_____

Task Supervisor's Signature _____

Telephone _____ Date _____

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FIELD PLACEMENT EXPERIENCE

1977/78

A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

STUDENT'S NAME: _____

AGE: _____ SEX: ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE

ETHNICITY: ☐ BLACK ☐ WHITE ☐ SPANISH-SPEAKING
☐ ASIAN ☐ OTHER (Specify) _____

MARITAL STATUS: ☐ SINGLE ☐ MARRIED ☐ SEP/DIVORCED

PERMANENT RESIDENCE STATUS: ☐ INNER-CITY ☐ SUBURB ☐ RURAL

DISCIPLINE:		SCHOOL AFFILIATION
SOCIAL WORK:	☐	_____
PSYCHOLOGY:	☐	_____
PUBLIC HEALTH:	☐	_____
EDUCATION:	☐	_____
NEW CAREERS:	☐	_____
LAW:	☐	_____
PSYCHIATRY:	☐	_____

STUDENT STATUS:
☐ UNDERGRADUATE
☐ PRE-DOCTORAL
☐ DOCTORAL
☐ OTHER (Specify)

PLACEMENT INFORMATION ☐ BRONX CENTER ☐ BROOKLYN CENTER

DENT UNIT LOCATION: ☐ MANHATTAN CENTER ☐ YORKTOWN HEIGHTS-CAMPUS

TIME IN PLACEMENT: ☐ THREE DAYS PER WEEK ☐ TWO DAYS PER WEEK

C. STUDENT ASSIGNMENTS

1. Were your learning tasks at this agency applicable to practice in terms of service to inner-city children and families? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, check the appropriate columns:

1. Working with individuals ☐
2. Working with families ☐
3. Working with groups ☐
4. Working with communities ☐

2. What other learning experience would help you to achieve the above goal? Please cite two possibilities.

1. _____
_____
_____

2. _____
_____
_____

3. Did you have enough tasks to perform at the agency in order to fulfill your learning experience? ☐ YES ☐ NO

4. Were you satisfied with your assignments at the agency? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, what sort of assignment do you prefer? Specify three choices in order of your preference:

1. _____
_____

2. _____
_____

3. _____
_____

Can you apply your classroom learning experience to your work at this agency?
☐ YES ☐ NO

D. QUALITY OF THE TRAINING PERSONNEL AND HOST AGENCY

(On these questions, rate the categories that are applicable on the scales provided from - 1(EXCELLENT); 2(VERY GOOD); 3(GOOD); 4(AVERAGE); 5(BELOW AVERAGE); 6(POOR) -) Please circle.)

1. How do you rate the quality of the:

(a) Field Work Supervision	1	2	3	4	5	6
(b) Placement Agency Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6
(c) I.G.T.P. Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6

2. Do you prefer a field work supervisor who is trained in your chosen field of specialization? [ ]YES [ ]NO

Explain :

_____

_____

_____

E. SEMINAR

1. Did you attend the seminars conducted by the I.G.T.P. [ ]YES [ ]NO
If YES, how many - [ ]ONE [ ]TWO

2a. Did these seminars help you to learn more about the inner-city problems, as it affects children and families? [ ]YES [ ]NO

b. If YES, can you effectively use this knowledge in working with inner-city children and families? [ ]YES [ ]NO

c. If you answered NO (to Question 2b), cite possible subject areas that would help to meet this need.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

b. If NO, what sorts of specific supports were you lacking at this agency?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

c. Cite three specific suggestions that could improve the level of agency support.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

2. Do you feel that this agency and its staff adequately accepted you in your role as a professional field work student? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, give three specific areas of non-acceptance you felt at this agency as a professional field work student.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

H. ADDITIONAL REFLECTIONS ON THE IGTP

How do you rate the IGTP program?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Poor

Did you notice any change in your expectations of this training program from the beginning of the field placement to now?

- ☐ Higher
- ☐ Lower
- ☐ Same

H. ADDITIONAL REFLECTIONS ON THE IGTP (continued)

3. Specify the three best aspects of this program according to your expectations, (the highest one first).

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. Three most negative aspects of the IGTP according to your expectations, (the lowest one first).

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

5. Are you satisfied with the present format of the field work training program of this agency? [ ] YES [ ] NO

If NO, what sort of alterations would you like to see in the IGTP of this agency. (Give three specific suggestions.)

1. _____

_____

_____

2. _____

_____

_____

3. _____

_____

_____

I. STUDENT PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL SUPPORT (continued)

4. The concept of interdisciplinary field work placement. Is this new to your school? ☐ YES ☐ NO

5. Is your school planning to send students for field work next year at this agency? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AWARE

GENERAL

Do you feel that this questionnaire adequately provides you a chance to express all your concerns? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, please specify your other concerns:

QUESTIONAIRRE – FOLLOW-UP

THE WILTWYCK SCHOOL
Interdisciplinary Generic Training Program

directions: please answer each question as prescribed; be as concise, brief and succint as possible. Print your answers.

Questions:

1. NAME _____

2. ADDRESS _____

3. PHONE NUMBER _____

4. What was you field of specialization as an I.G.T.P. INTERN?

_____

5. Who is your present employer ? (name, address, phone #, immediate supervisor)

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. What is your job title and job description?

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Do you feel that your experience in IGTP has helped you in fulfilling your present job duties? YES_____ NO_____

7a. If not, why not? _____

_____

_____

7b. If so, please tell what about the experience was helpful?

Skill training _____
Seminars _____
Guest Speakers _____
Other _____

8. What aspects of IGTP experience do you think of most often?

_____

9. How do these abovementioned aspects relate to your current work or life experience?

_____

_____

_____

10. What do you consider to be the major shortcomings in your IGTP experience?

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Where would you say the source of the problems with your IGTP experience lie:

a. the regulations of the program _____
b. the director _____
c. the trainer/supervisor _____
d. the administrative assistant _____
e. fellow interns _____
f. self _____
g. the Wiltwyck staff _____
h. the physical setting _____
i. other (state) _____

12. What suggestions do you have for overcoming the abovementioned difficulties?

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. What do you feel you missed most in terms of your training at IGTP that could have helped you now ?

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. Do you feel that your training assisted in accomplishing the following? If so, to what degree?

a. development of leadership training

0.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7.....8
not fulfilled — very much fulfilled

b. offerance of both generic and specific training related to your field of specialization

0.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7.....8
not fulfilled — very much fulfilled

c. experimenting with various team combinations

0.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7.....8
not fulfilled — very much fulfilled

FROM THE OFFICE OF: Mr. Harold S. Brown, Jr.
Project Director, IGTP 76-77/77-78